

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

This Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) contains the public and agency comments received during the public review period for the Alpine Sierra Subdivision (proposed project), and the responses to each of those comments. It also includes those pages from the Draft EIR that have been revised in response to the comments.

The EIR is an informational document intended to disclose the environmental consequences that would result if the proposed project or one of the alternatives is approved and implemented. All written comments received on the Draft EIR during the public review period (September 19, 2017 through November 3, 2017) are addressed in this Final EIR.

1.1 CEQA REQUIREMENTS

Under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the lead agency must prepare and certify a Final EIR prior to a proposed project being approved. This Final EIR was prepared in accordance with CEQA (California Public Resources Code, Section 21000 et seq.). CEQA Guidelines Section 15132 states that the Final EIR shall consist of the following:

- The Draft EIR or a revision of the Draft
- Comments and recommendations received on the Draft EIR, either verbatim or in summary
- A list of persons, organizations, and public agencies commenting on the Draft EIR
- The lead agency's responses to significant environmental points raised in the review and consultation process
- Any other information added by the lead agency

The lead agency (for this project, Placer County (County)) must provide each agency that commented on the Draft EIR with a copy of the lead agency's responses to those comments within a minimum of 10 days before certifying the Final EIR. The Final EIR allows commenting agencies and the public an opportunity to review revisions to the Draft EIR and the responses to comments.

This Alpine Sierra Subdivision EIR serves to inform the County's consideration of the proposed project. This EIR includes evaluation of two project alternatives at an equal level of detail: Alternative A – the applicant's originally proposed project, and Alternative B, which was developed to reduce some of the impacts of Alternative A. The EIR also includes analysis of other alternatives to the proposed project, which are discussed in the Draft EIR (Chapter 16, CEQA Considerations).

This Final EIR provides responses to all comments received on the Draft EIR. The responses clarify, correct, and/or amplify text in the Draft EIR, as appropriate. Chapter 2 begins with a set of Master Responses that address issues raised in numerous comment letters received on the Draft EIR as well as individual responses to comments. The Master Responses were developed to provide comprehensive responses to address specific topics and impact analyses that received similar or repeated comments from multiple commenters during the Draft EIR public comment period. The Final EIR also includes text changes made to the Draft EIR either in response to comments or at the initiative of the County. These changes are summarized in Table 1-2 (see Section 1.4, Summary of Draft EIR Text Changes), identified in the Master Responses and responses to comments in Chapter 2 and shown in strikeout/underline format in Chapter 3, Text Changes to the Draft EIR. The revisions to the Draft EIR text do not alter the conclusions of the Draft EIR. Chapter 4 of the Final EIR presents the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the project. A list of references cited in the Final EIR is provided in Chapter 5, and a list of EIR Preparers is provided in Chapter 6.

1.2 CERTIFICATION OF THE FINAL EIR

The comments and responses that make up the Final EIR, in combination with the Draft EIR as amended by the text changes shown in this document, constitute the EIR that will be considered for certification by the County’s decision-makers. As required by Section 15090(a)(1)–(3) of the CEQA Guidelines, in certifying a Final EIR, a lead agency must make the following three determinations:

1. The Final EIR has been completed in compliance with CEQA;
2. The Final EIR was presented to the decision-making body of the lead agency, and the decision-making body reviewed and considered the information in the Final EIR prior to approving the project; and
3. The Final EIR reflects the lead agency’s independent judgment and analysis.

As required by CEQA Guidelines Section 15091, no public agency shall approve or carry out a project for which an EIR has been certified that identifies one or more significant environmental effects of the project unless the public agency makes one or more written findings (Findings of Fact) for each of those significant effects, accompanied by a brief explanation of the rationale for each finding, supported by substantial evidence in the record. The possible findings are as follows:

1. Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

2. Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
3. Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR (14 CCR 15091).

The Findings of Fact are included in a separate document that will be considered for adoption by the County's decision makers at the time of project approval. The Draft EIR finds that project would not result in any significant and unavoidable impacts, therefore a Statement of Overriding Considerations is not required.

1.3 RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

A total of 40 comment letters were received and each letter and response is included in Chapter 3, as listed below in Table 1-1. Each comment letter is numbered and presented with brackets indicating how the letter has been divided into individual comments. Each comment is given a binomial with the number of the comment letter appearing first, followed by the comment number. For example, the single comment in Letter A1 is numbered A1-1. In addition, verbal comments received at the Planning Commission hearing on October 26, 2017 are summarized and responded to at the end of Chapter 2. Responses to comments are presented following the letters, each with binomials that correspond to the bracketed comments. As the subject matter of one topic may overlap between letters, the reader may need to refer to one or more responses to review all the information on a given subject. To assist the reader, cross-references to other comments are provided. In addition, master responses have been prepared to address issues or concerns that were raised in multiple comments. The master responses precede the comment letters and, where applicable, the individual responses to comments refer the reader back to the applicable master response(s). The focus of the responses to comments is on the disposition of significant environmental issues raised in the comments, as specified by Section 15088(c) of the CEQA Guidelines. Comments have been reviewed, analyzed, and evaluated, and substantive comments on the Draft EIR have been given a response. When a comment does not address significant environmental issues and does not raise specific issues related to the adequacy of the environmental analysis, the response indicates that no further response is necessary.

Table 1-1
Index of Commenters on the Draft Environmental Impact Report

Comment Letter	Date of Letter	Commenter	Response Nos.
<i>A. Federal Agencies</i>			
A1	October 17, 2017	Ian Vogel, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	A1-1
<i>B. State Agencies</i>			
B1	November 3, 2017	Office of Planning and Research, State Clearinghouse	B1-1
<i>C. Local Agencies</i>			
C1	October 18, 2017	Jason A. Parker, Tahoe-Truckee Sanitation Agency	C1-1 to C1-3
C2	November 6, 2017	Brad Brewer, Placer County Flood Control and Water Conservation District	C2-1
<i>D. Native American Tribes</i>			
D1	October 17, 2017	Gene Whitehouse, United Auburn Indian Community	D1-1
<i>E. Organizations</i>			
E1	October 25, 2015	Lisa Wallace and Eben Swain, Truckee River Watershed Council	E1-1 to E1-8
E2	October 25, 2017	Susan Gearhart and Jennifer Quashnick, Friends of the West Shore	E2-1 to E2-6
E3	November 3, 2017	Jason Flanders, ATA Law Group, on behalf of Bear Creek Association	E3-1 to E3-36
<i>F. Individuals</i>			
F1	September 24, 2017	Steve Anderson	F1-1 to F1-2
F2	October 21, 2017	Steve Anderson	F2-1
F3	October 29, 2017	Rachelle Latimer	F3-1 to F3-19
F4	October 30, 2017	Judy Bruner	F4-1 to F4-26
F5	October 30, 2017	David Taylor	F5-1
F6	October 30, 2017	Billy Volkmann	F6-1 to F6-15
F7	October 31, 2017	David Anhalt	F7-1 to F7-18
F8	October 31, 2017	Jerry Cahill	F8-1 to F8-3
F9	October 31, 2017	Donald L. Jones	F9-1
F10	October 31, 2017	Sharla Menlove Chador	F10-1 to F10-16
F11	October 31, 2017	Keri Tully	F11-1 to F11-18
F12	November 1, 2017	Robert H. Cole	F12-1 to F12-15
F13	November 1, 2017	Daniel D. Heagerty	F13-1 to F13-22
F14	November 1, 2017	Lauren Ross	F14-1 to F14-7
F15	November 1, 2017	Ann Van Ess	F15-1 to F15-19
F16	November 2, 2017	Elaine Geffen	F16-1 to F16-9
F17	November 2, 2017	Dr. Katherine Hover-Smoot	TBD
F18	November 3, 2017	Jennifer Absey	F18-1 to F18-12
F19	November 3, 2017	Dean Amundson	F19-1 to F19-25
F20	November 3, 2017	Ryan Carlson and Melissa Winn	F20-1 to F20-15
F21	November 3, 2017	Elise Duncan	F21-1 to F21-4
F22	November 3, 2017	Pete Geffen	F22-1 to F22-2

Table 1-1
Index of Commenters on the Draft Environmental Impact Report

Comment Letter	Date of Letter	Commenter	Response Nos.
F23	November 3, 2017	Andrew Hays	F23-1 to F23-7
F24	November 3, 2017	Leo E. Heagerty	F24-1 to F24-5
F25	November 3, 2017	Aramie and Kevin McDonald	F25-1 to F25-3
F26	November 3, 2017	John Moise	F26-1 to F26-13
F27	No Date	Andrew Branagh	F27-1 to F27-5
F28	No Date	Michael Nashner	F28-1 to F28-6
F29	No Date	George Sauter and Susan Biddle	F29-1 to F29-14
F30	No Date	Ernest Wertheim	F30-1 to F30-22
F31	No Date	Annie Yates and John Dawes	F31-1 to F31-18
F32	No Date	Griffith Tully	F32-1 to F32-18
<i>PC. Comments Received at the Planning Commission</i>			
PC	October 26, 2017	Various	PC-1 to PC-53

1.4 SUMMARY OF DRAFT EIR TEXT CHANGES

Table 1-2 identifies all changes made to the Draft EIR. These text changes provide additional clarification for the responses to comments received on the Draft EIR and identify revisions and supplemental information added to the EIR appendices. The text changes do not change the conclusions presented in the Draft EIR regarding the significance of the proposed project's environmental impacts. The pages from the Draft EIR on which text revisions were made are included in this Final EIR (Chapter 4). Upon certification of the Final EIR by the County, the Draft EIR, as revised, will be reprinted in whole and posted to the County's website.

Table 1-2
Summary of Draft EIR Text Changes

Draft EIR Page No.	Revised Draft EIR Page No.*	Text Revision Made
2-9	2-9	Correct text identifying whether the project would result in significant and unavoidable impacts
2-11	2-11	Correct Mitigation Measure 5.1c – change “Implementation” to “Improvement”
2-12	2-12	Add specification for LED lighting to Mitigation Measure 5.3a
2-13	2-13 through 2-15	Add Mitigation Measure 6.1c regarding yellow-legged frog
2-13	2-16	Add specifications to Mitigation Measure 6.2b
2-15	2-17	Omit “vernal pools” from Mitigation Measure 6.4a
2-15	2-17	Correct text identifying the determination of Mitigation Measure 6.4b

Table 1-2
Summary of Draft EIR Text Changes

Draft EIR Page No.	Revised Draft EIR Page No.*	Text Revision Made
2-17	2-19	Correct text in Mitigation Measure 6.7a – change “issuance” to “approval”
2-30	2-32	Correct text in Mitigation Measure 12.4b – change “Department” to “Division”
2-31	2-33 through 2-34	Revise Mitigation Measure 13.1c to match the text of this measure in Chapter 13
2-36	2-39	Clarify text in Mitigation Measure 15.7a
3-10	3-10	Clarify wastewater collection and treatment
3-13	3-13	Add Tahoe-Truckee Sanitation Agency to list of utility providers
5-7	5-7	Add reference to figure showing existing conditions and a figure showing projected visual impacts
5-12	5-12	Correct Mitigation Measure 5.1c – change “Implementation” to “Improvement”
5-17	5-17	Add specification for LED lighting to Mitigation Measure 5.3a
5-25	5-25	Add existing conditions figure
6-7	6-7	Expand discussion of yellow-legged frog
6-14	6-14	Add reference to Mitigation Measure 6.1c
6-15	6-15	Correct typographic error
6-16 and 6-15	6-16 through 6-19	Expand discussion of yellow-legged frog and add Mitigation Measure 6.1c
6-20 and 6-21	6-23	Clarify requirements of Mitigation Measure 6.2b related to providing compensation for loss of riparian habitat.
6-23	6-26 and 6-27	Correct text identifying the determination of Mitigation Measure 6.4b
6-29	6-32	Correct text in Mitigation Measure 6.7a – change “issuance” to “approval”
12-6 and 12-27	12-6 and 12-27	Update reference to FEMA flood insurance rate map, correct typographic error
12-28	12-28	Correct text in Mitigation Measure 12.4b – change “Department” to “Division”
13-14	13-14	Correct list of applicable mitigation measures
14-4 and 14-28	14-4 and 14-28	Clarify wastewater collection and treatment
15-15	15-15	Clarify text in Mitigation Measure 15.7a
Not included	Appendix D3	Add Alpine Sierra Subdivision Sierra Nevada Yellow-legged Frog Surveys Technical Memorandum to EIR appendices
Not included	Appendix E4	Add Supplemental Memo to Traffic Impact Analysis to EIR appendices
Appendix J2	Appendix J2	Add exhibits to the Alpine Sierra Forest Management and Fuel Reduction Plan
Appendix J3	Appendix J3	Clarify and modify the Emergency Preparedness and Evacuation Plan

* Page numbering shown in Chapter 3, Text Changes to the Draft Environmental Impact Report.